

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
07/12/2004	Rolf Theo Anton Apetz	NL020017	5379	
0 12/15/2005		EXAM	EXAMINER	
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS		SANEI, HAN	SANEI, HANA ASMAT	
P.O. BOX 3001 BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	07/12/2004) 12/15/2005 LLECTUAL PROPE	07/12/2004 Rolf Theo Anton Apetz 12/15/2005 LLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS	07/12/2004 Rolf Theo Anton Apetz NL020017 12/15/2005 EXAM LLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS SANEI, HAT	

DATE MAILED: 12/15/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/501,165	ANTON APETZ ET AI	L.		
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Hana A. Sanei	2879			
 Period for	The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Reply	pears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence addre	ss		
WHICH - Extens after S - If NO p - Failure Any re	PRTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING Districtions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. IX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Seriod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut ply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUN 136(a). In no event, however, may a will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO te, cause the application to become A	ICATION. reply be timely filed NTHS from the mailing date of this comm. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1) ⊠ F	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 (October 2005.				
2a) 🔲 📑	2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ⊠ This action is non-final.					
•	3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
(closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.	D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.			
Dispositio	on of Claims					
4) 🛛 (Claim(s) <u>1-7</u> is/are pending in the application.					
	a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra	awn from consideration.				
•=	Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
•	Claim(s) <u>1-7</u> is/are rejected.					
	Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	or election requirement				
·		or oloolor roquirement				
Application	on Papers					
	he specification is objected to by the Examin					
,	10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on 12 July 2004 is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre			1 121(d)		
	The oath or declaration is objected to by the E					
•	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
a)[∑	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document	nts have been received.				
	2. Certified copies of the priority documer3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority			age		
•	application from the International Bures			-3-		
* Se	ee the attached detailed Office action for a lis		t received.			
Attachment						
	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		Summary (PTO-413) o(s)/Mail Date			
3) 🔲 Inform	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 No(s)/Mail Date		Informal Patent Application (PTO-15	52)		

Application/Control Number: 10/501,165

Art Unit: 2879

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

The Amendment, filed on 10/13/05, has been entered and acknowledged by the Examiner.

Claims 1-7 are pending in the instant application

Priority

Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 1. Claims 1 and 6-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Torikai et al (US 6375533 B1) in view of Niimi (US 6635993 B1).

With respect to Claim 1, Torikai teaches a high-pressure discharge lamp (see at least Figures 1 and 3) provided with a discharge vessel (70) with a ceramic wall (11, Col. 6, lines 11-14) which is closed at one end by a plug (50) provided with an electrode (upholding part of electrode, 40) arranged in discharge vessel, a fusion joint (diffusion accelerator, 50) comprising an alloy comprising substantially molybdenum and aluminum (Col. 5, lines 9-20 & Col. 7, lines 9-21). Torikai lacks the fusion joint being jointed between the ceramic wall and the plug. In the same field of endeavor, Niimi

Art Unit: 2879

teaches the ceramic wall (see at least Figure 16, #38) and the plug (second cylindrical sealing member, 39) being jointed by a fusion joint (first sealing member, 37) in order to ensure high strength, improved air-tightness and resistance to corrosion (Col. 2, lines 5-12). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to modify the location of the fusion joint, as disclosed by Niimi, in the high-pressure discharge lamp of Torikai, in order to ensure high strength, improved air-tightness and resistance to corrosion.

With respect to Claim 6, Torikai teaches a metal halide lamp (Col. 4, lines 34-40).

With respect to Claim 7, Torikai teaches that the lamp has a power rating of at least 100 W (Col. 4, lines 34-40).

2. Claims 2-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Torikai et al (US 6375533 B1) in view of Niimi (US 6635993 B1) in further view of Chen (US 20020141294 B1).

With respect to Claims 2-3, Torikai-Niimi teaches the invention set forth above (see rejection in Claim 1 above). Torikai-Niimi is silent regarding the specific structural formula of the fusion joint composition. In the same field of endeavor, Chen teaches a fusion joint comprising AlMo (undercoat, Page 2, Par [0041]) in order to provide a better control of heating applied to device. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to modify the composition of the fusion joint, as disclosed by Chen, in the high-pressure discharge lamp of Torikai-Niimi in order to provide a better control of heating applied to device.

3. Claims 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Torikai et al (US 6375533 B1) in view of Niimi (US 6635993 B1) in further view of Wei et al (US 6020685).

With respect to Claim 4, Torikai-Niimi teaches the invention set forth above (see rejection in Claim 1 above). Torikai-Niimi is silent regarding a plug comprising a material formed by molybdenum or tungsten. In the same field of endeavor, Wei teaches a plug comprising a material formed by molybdenum or tungsten (Col. 2, lines 29-31). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to choose from one of the materials disclosed by Wei, since Wei teaches the suitability of using a plug formed of molybdenum or tungsten and it has been held to be within the general skill of an artisan to select a known material on the basis of the intended use. See MPEP 2144.07.

With respect to Claim 5, Torikai-Niimi teaches the invention set forth above (see rejection in Claim 1 above). Torikai-Niimi is silent regarding a ceramic wall comprised of aluminum nitride. In the same field of endeavor, Wei teaches a ceramic wall comprised of aluminum nitride (Col. 12, lines 65-67). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to choose from one of the materials disclosed by Wei, since Wei teaches the suitability of using a ceramic wall comprised of aluminum nitride and it has been held to be within the general skill of an artisan to select a known material on the basis of the intended use. See MPEP 2144.07.

Application/Control Number: 10/501,165

Art Unit: 2879

Other Prior Art Cited

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

Izumiya et al (US 4731561) teaches a high-pressure discharge lamp with a ceramic envelope and end caps.

Response to Amendment

Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hana A. Sanei whose telephone number is (571) 272-8654. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday- Friday, 9 am - 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nimeshkumar D. Patel can be reached on (571) 272-2457. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Examiner

Hana A. Sanei

12/8/05

NIMESHKUMAR D. PATEL SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINEF.

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800